arXiv:quant-ph/0202099v1 19 Feb 2002

Bell's inequalities and indeterminism

Ramón Risco-Delgado

September, 2001

Abstract

The inequality of Clauser and Horne [*Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526 (1974)], intended to overcome the limited scope of other inequalities to deterministic theories, is shown to have a resticted validity even in case of perfect detectors and perfect angular correlations.

In the current debate on local hidden variables (l.h.v.) [1] we try to clarify some points around one of the inequalities that there exists in the literature in order to contrast quantum mechanics with local realism.

Such inequalities begin with Bell's [2]. He proved that, if we do an experiment in which two spatially separated measurements are performed with perfect detectors, the correlations of their results must satisfy a certain inequality if they are to be explained by a local deterministic theory. There are two conditions for this inequality, namely determinism and perfect detectors. In order to perform an experiment with optical photons, for which the effective efficiency is still nowadays rather low, Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt [3] derived an inequality from the assumptions of local realism, determinism and, what they called the "fair sampling assumption". This inequality could be carried to the laboratory and it was found to be experimentally violated. However there was a class of local realistic theories, those with a essential stochasticity (or nondeterministic) that were not tested.

The next step was made by Clauser and Horne (CH) [4]. Their aim was to obtain an inequality for low efficiency, valid for what they called *Local Objective Theories*, which include such nondeterministic theories. The article begins by establishing the following

> Consider the state specification of the...system at a time intermediate between its emission and its impinging on either measuring apparatus. Denote this state by λ. Note that we do not necessarily make a commitment to the completeness of this state specification...As the state described initially by λ evolves, it may or may not trigger a count at apparatus 1, and similarly it may or may nor do so at apparatus 2. The initial state λ, if it serves the same role as in existing theories, will suffice to determine *at least* the probabilities of these events. Let the probabilities of a count being triggered at apparatus 1 and 2 be $p_1(\lambda, a)$ and $p_2(\lambda, b)$ respectively, and let $p_{12}(\lambda, a, b)$ be the probability that both counts are triggered.

They then introduced *factorability* as a "reasonable" locality condition. In their words "the factored form is a natural expression of a field-theoretical point of view, which in turn is an extrapolation from the common-sense view that there is no action at distance." The factorability assumption is

$$p_{12}(\lambda, a, b) = p_1(\lambda, a)\ p_2(\lambda, b) \tag{1}$$

In appendix A of their article they proved that the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} U(a, a', b, b', \lambda) = p_1(\lambda, a)\ p_2(\lambda, b) - p_1(\lambda, a)\ p_2(\lambda, b') + p_1(\lambda, a')\ p_2(\lambda, b) \\ + p_1(\lambda, a')\ p_2(\lambda, b') - p_1(\lambda, a') - \ p_2(\lambda, b) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

satisfies $-1 \leq U(a, a', b, b', \lambda) \leq 0$. By replacing, in this inequality, the product of probabilities by the joint probability (from (1)), integrating over $\rho(\lambda)\ d\lambda$, and with the aid of the "no-enhancement" hypothesis $[p_1(\lambda, a) \leq p_1(\lambda, \infty)$, where $p_1(\lambda, \infty)$ is the detection probability with the polarizer removed, and similarly for $p_2(\lambda, b)]$, the CH inequality follows:

$$-p_{12}(\infty, \infty) \leq p_{12}(a, b) - p_{12}(a, b') + p_{12}(a', b) + p_{12}(a', b') - p_{12}(a', \infty) - p_{12}(\infty, b) \leq 0 \tag{3}$$

We shall show that i) there exist local realistic situations that do not satisfy (1), and ii) that those situations in which it is satisfied are trivial cases in which either $U(a, a', b, b', \lambda) = -1$ or $U(a, a', b, b', \lambda) = 0$ (something both stronger and simpler to prove than the inequality derived the appendix A of CH).

i) Suppose that two classical systems (i.e. two particles) correlated in the source are emitted toward two opposite detectors. The particles can be in one of two states to be measured, that we shall call "up" and "down". The correlation is such that the quantity to be measured has equal values for the two systems, that is, there are only cases of "up-up" or "down-down" of emissions from the source, each with, let's say 1/2 of essential, irreducible probability. Of course the systems can have l.h.v. λ, but λ does not suffice to fix the results of the measurement. For a given value of λ we have $p_1(\lambda, a \equiv up) = 1/2, p_2(\lambda, b \equiv up) = 1/2$, but $p_{12}(\lambda, a \equiv up, b \equiv up) = 1/2 \neq p_1(\lambda, a \equiv up)\ p_2(\lambda, b \equiv up) = 1/4$. This simple counterexample shows that (1) is not general enough to embrace all forms of local realism. Similar results are obtained for any type of correlation in the source (i.e."up-down").

ii) In case of absolute determinism $p_1(\lambda, a) = 1$ or 0, and $p_2(\lambda, b) = 1$ or 0. This means that there are sixteen cases for U, as a function of the values of $p_1$and p_2. Half of them give $U = -1$, the others give $U = 0$.

To sum up, in case of *determinism* not only is $-1 \leq U(a, a', b, b', \lambda) \leq 0$ satisfied, but always either $U = -1$ or $U = 0$. In case of *nondeterminism* (1) simply does not hold. Therefore the question of nondeterministic local realism is left open in CH. However we shall see that nevertheless it can be closed in the following way.

Suppose that Nature is essentially stochastic and therefore $p_1(\lambda, a)$ and $p_2(\lambda, b)$ are in general different from 0 and 1.Then, there always exists another two functions $\widetilde{p}_1(\lambda, \mu, a)$ and $\widetilde{p}_2(\lambda, \mu, b)$, which take only values 0 or 1, defined in the following way: $\widetilde{p}_1(\lambda, \mu, a) = 1$ if $0 \leq \mu \leq p_1(\lambda, a)$; $\widetilde{p}_1(\lambda, \mu, a) = 0$ if $p_1(\lambda, a) \leq \mu \leq 1$ (similar for $\widetilde{p}_2(\lambda, \mu, b)$). One is free to believe or not in the real existence of the hidden variable μ. The point is that because $p_1(\lambda, a) = \int \widetilde{p}_1(\lambda, \mu, a)\ d\mu$ (similar for $p_2(\lambda, b)$) then the factual quantity $p_1(a)$ can always be the result of the integration over the set of hidden variables λ and μ: $p_1(a) = \int \widetilde{p}_1(\lambda, \mu, a)\ d\lambda\ d\mu$ (similar for $p_2(b)$). This result means that any essentially stochastic theory can be included within a more general deterministic theory. Of course, it can be applied to quantum mechanics and therefore the inequalities can be used in principle to contrast it versus local realism. On the other hand, this result is a prove of the room for hidden variables. The consequence for the CH inequality is that the nondeterministic case is also contained in this inequality, but as a particular case of the deterministic one. This result also applies to weakest definitions of local realism [5].

I am grateful for a critical reading of the manuscipt by T.W. Marshall, E.

Santos and A. Casado. I also aknowledge the nice comments on this subject from M. Horne at the Institute für ExperimentalPhysik (Innsbruck) and the friendship of the people there: M. Reck, H. Weinfurter, J.W. Pan, M. Michler, G. Wehis, B. Dopfer, T. Jennewein, D. Bowmeester and A. Zeilinger.

References

[1] M. A. Rowe, D. Kielpinski, V. Meyer, C. A. Sackett, W. M. Itano, C. Monroe, and D. J. Wineland, Nature **409**, 791-794 (2001).

[2] J.S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1965).

[3] J.F. Clauser, M. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 990 (1969).

[4] J.F. Clauser and M. Horne, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526 (1974).

[5] F. Selleri, *Phylosophia Naturalis* **28**, 17 (1991).